



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,931	04/03/2001	Michael P. Mittmann	3381	2137

22886 7590 09/23/2004

AFFYMETRIX, INC  
ATTN: CHIEF IP COUNSEL, LEGAL DEPT.  
3380 CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95051

EXAMINER

MARSCHER, ARDIN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/824,931

**Applicant(s)**

MITTMANN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ardin Marschel

**Art Unit**

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004 and 25 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date (1 sheet).
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1631

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' arguments, filed 7/1/04 and 8/25/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

### **NEW MATTER**

Claims 1-16, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

NEW MATTER has been added to the claims in that all of the independent claims now cite the phrase "each synthesis area is separated by a discard area". Applicants pointed to page 26, lines 16 et seq. for written support for this amendment. Consideration of said page 26 citation reveals that the discard area is specifically additionally described with the limitation that said area separates each synthesis area from its nearest neighbors. Thus the position of the discard area is defined as filed but not defined in the above phrase that has been added to the instant claims. This lack of positioning limitation in the amendment results in NEW MATTER being added. The broader limitation as noted above in the claims is not limited as to what separation practice is meant for the discard area. Beyond separating nearest neighbors such a

Art Unit: 1631

separation may be a separation of subareas within each synthesis area. Alternatively, such a separation may be a separation from other surface elements on the substrate such as separation from an edge, separation from a non-synthesis area etc. Thus, the broadening of the limitation over what is disclosed as filed is NEW MATTER. This rejection is necessitated by amendment.

### **PRIOR ART**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(1) as being clearly anticipated by Hess et al. (2002/0094533).

This rejection is reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 1/5/04, and as necessitated by amendment regarding newly added claim limitations. Applicants argue in REMARKS, filed 7/1/04, that Hess et al. fails to describe a mask which is subdivided into a plurality of discrete reticle areas and further wherein the mask is further subdivided into a plurality of discrete reticles. In response there is no step in independent claims 1 or 9 nor dependent claims which direct the claim practice to such subdividing steps. Rather the mask of the instant claims are described in the respective preambles as such. Thus, the manner of making a mask is not an actual claim step and

Art Unit: 1631

thus a mask with reticle areas and discrete reticles made by a variety of methods may be utilized in the actual claim steps alternatively with one with particular making requirements as long as the mask ends up the same as utilized in the actual claim steps. The mask of Hess et al. has previously been described as having reticles as grid patterns as instantly utilized in the actual claim steps and thus still supports anticipation of the actual claim steps. Applicants further argue that the masks of the reference are not sequentially aligned with a synthesis area in sequence. In response Hess et al. utilizes such sequential alignment for polymer synthesis as different masks are needed for different polymer synthesis steps therein due to noting previously that polymers are synthesized via masks in the reference. Applicants further argue that the discard area limitations recently added to the instant claims distinguish over Hess et al. In response the above NEW MATTER rejection illustrates the broad interpretations that are reasonable regarding this discard area limitation inclusion of substrate areas in Hess et al. which are discarded regarding synthesis as not being utilized at the edge, for example of the substrate and thus does not distinguish the instant invention over Hess et al. Thus, in summary, Hess et al. is still deemed to anticipate the instant invention as claimed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1631

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-16, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hess et al. (2002/0094533) taken in view of In re Venner [262 F.2d 91,95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958)].

This rejection is reiterated from the previous office action, mailed 1/5/04, and as necessitated by amendment regarding newly added claim limitations. Applicants do not argue this rejection separately from the above arguments regarding the 102 rejection. The above arguments are equally non-persuasive here and are responded to as above. Thus, this rejection still is deemed proper.

No claim is allowed.

Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1631

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 19, 2004

*Ardin H. Marschel* 9/19/04  
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER